

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LD, ET AL.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

UNITED BEHAVIORAL HEALTH, ET AL.,

Defendants.

Case No.: 4:20-cv-02254-YGR

**ORDER ADOPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE’S
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION, DENYING
DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR RELIEF**

DKT. NOS. 477, 484, 486, 487

The Court has reviewed Magistrate Judge Spero’s Report and Recommendation (Dkt. No. 484 “Report”) Recommending Denying United Behavioral Health’s (“United’s”) Motion to extend fact discovery (Dkt. No. 477). The Court has further reviewed Magistrate Judge Spero’s discovery order (Dkt. No. 485) denying United’s request to compel production of certain documents (Dkt. No. 480). The Court has also carefully reviewed United’s objection to the Report and its motion for relief from the discovery order. United’s objections are overruled. The Court finds the Report and discovery order correct, well-reasoned, and thorough, and adopts them in every respect.

A motion for relief from a non-dispositive order should only be granted when the moving party establishes that the non-dispositive order by the magistrate judge is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72; *see Bhan v. NME Hospitals, Inc.*, 929 F.2d 1404, 1414 (9th Cir.1991) (“the magistrate’s decision on a nondispositive issue will be reviewed by the district judge under the clearly erroneous standard”); *Barnes & Noble, Inc. v. LSI Corp.*, No. C–11–2709 EMC, 2013 WL 841334, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 6, 2013) (same). “In finding that the magistrate judge’s decision is ‘clearly erroneous,’ the Court must arrive at a definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been

1 committed.” *Barnes & Noble* , 2013 WL 841334 at *1 (internal citations and quotations omitted).
2 This standard of review is extremely deferential. *Id.*

3 United fails to refute the well-reasoned opinion of Magistrate Judge Spero and the Court finds
4 no clear error.

5 Accordingly, and for the reasons set forth in the Report, discovery order, and herein, United’s
6 objections to the Report are **OVERRULED**, and the motion for relief from the discovery order is
7 **DENIED**.

8
9 This Order terminates Dkt. Nos. 477, 484, 486, 487.

10 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

11 **Date:** August 11, 2025

12 
13 YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

United States District Court

Northern District of California